

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/044,426 | 11/13/2001 | Helle Woldike | 5565.214-US | 3262 |
| 7. | 590 03/28/2003 | | | |
| Reza Green, Esq. Novo Nordisk of North America, Inc. | | | EXAMINER | |
| 405 Lexington | Avenue, Suite 6400 | | MARVICH, MARIA | |
| New York, NY 10174-6401 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| <i>*</i> | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/044,426 | WOLDIKE ET AL. | | | | |
| , | Examin r | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Maria B Marvich, PhD | 1636 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspond nce address | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this applice to a timely filed amendment whi | cation. A proper reply to a | | | | |
| | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>21 February 2003</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | erially reducing or simplifying the | | | | |
| (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE: | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a so | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendment raises new issues and new matter . | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | (s) a) \boxtimes will not be entered or b) old be rejected is provided belo | o☐ will be entered and an ow or appended. | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5 and 7-10</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | DAVID GUZO | | | | |
| 10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> | | PRIMARY EXAMINER Land Jugar | | | | |
| Patent and Trademark Office | | | | | | |

 Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 10/044,426

Application No.

Continuation of 2 a and b) The claims if amended as proposed in the amendment filed 3/3/03, raises new issue and new matter requiring further consideration and a prior art search. Amendment of the claim language from a yeast derived endoprotease having Kex 2 enzymatic activity to a Kex 2 variant having Kex 2 enymatic activity adds the limitation that the endoprotease be a Kex2 variant which finds no clear basis in the original disclosure. The specification does not define or describe a Kex 2 variant the scope of which is unclear.

Continuation of 10. Other: Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3 which applicant proposes be cancelled .